THEOLOGY

VOL. LI JANUARY, 1948 NO. 331

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL

The Inauguration of Church Union in South India

THOUGH I have been in this country only six months, and therefore can lay no great claim to represent the diocese in which I am stationed, I had the good fortune to receive at the last minute a ticket to be one of the representatives of Dornakal diocese at the services of inauguration of the South India Church in Madras on September 27. The services were held in St George's Cathedral, a fairly large, Palladian-style building, recalling in every feature the wealthy Europeans whom it was originally destined to serve. On this occasion it was completely filled with the representatives, both clerical and lay, of the three uniting churches. There was also a large annexe outside the south wall of the cathedral, where visitors and friends of those directly involved sat. An excellent loud-speaker service meant that everyone could hear every word of what was said, though only the more fortunate half could see what was taking place. The great majority of the delegates were Indians, and nearly everyone was dressed in white, most of us in white cassocks.

There were two services: the first, in which the inauguration of union was formally announced by the representatives of the three uniting churches, and the second, in which nine new bishops were consecrated for the united church. The first service began at 8 a.m. and lasted only an hour. The whole of John xvii was first read; afterwards a representative of each of the uniting churches—the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, the Methodist Church in South India, and the South India United Church (itself a union some forty years old of Presbyterians and Congregationalists)—read out the resolutions of the various governing bodies of the churches from which they came, giving permission for their respective churches to take part in the union; and a copy of the Basis of Union, together with the signed assent of the clergy of all the three churches to the union, was placed on the altar. Bishop Jacob (ex-Anglican bishop of Travancore) then formally declared that the three churches are become one Church of South India. The Te Deum was sung, and afterwards the six ex-Anglican bishops were given authority by representatives of the two other churches to exercise the office of a bishop in the congregations which they represented.[1] It only remained to authorize all the ministers of the three uniting churches who were present to exercise their ministry in the united church. This was done orally by Bishop Jacob, the various ministers present standing up in their places to receive the

[1] Six, because there were four former diocesans—Travancore, Tinnevelly, Madras and Dornakal—one assistant bishop to Dornakal, who is now appointed to a new diocese, Kistna, and Bishop Pakenham Walsh, who was commissioned as bishop without charge. At this point the first five were appointed to their various dioceses in the United Church.

34243

V.51
948

commission. This authorization is to be given to the rest of the ministers at the various diocesan inauguration celebrations.

After half an hour's interval, the second service began at 9.30 and lasted till 12.15. The service began with the entry of the six ex-Anglican bishops and three presbyters from each of the two other uniting churches. The bishops and bishops-elect were wearing rochet and saffron stole (saffron is the colour symbolical of renunciation in India). The service proceeded according to the 1662 Prayer Book Communion Rite, including the Decalogue, until after the sermon, which came in the usual place after the Nicene Creed. It was preached by the Rev. J. S. M. Hooper, who has been for some years secretary of the Joint Committee negotiating the union. He very neatly adapted St Augustine's prayer before his conversion, applying it to the attitude of many Christians towards reunion: "Make us one—but not now." Now at last we had taken the great step. It was certainly a costly one, as the difficulties and controversies surrounding the union testified, but we felt clearly that not to take that step would mean disobedience to God. The preacher commented on the fact that this formation of an independent United Church coincided with the establishment of an independent India. He also claimed that none of the uniting churches was bringing to union anything essential to the being of the Church which the other uniting churches did not already possess—a statement which one member of the congregation at least would find it hard to accept without qualification. He ended on a fine note by stressing the paramount importance of guarding the content of the Gospel, threatened as it sometimes was in India by ill-conceived efforts to clothe it in Indian dress. It was not a scheme of high ideals or a corpus of good advice that we were concerned to proclaim, but the truth concerning the Incarnation of the Word of God.

The nine bishops-elect were then presented. It may be interesting to observe that of these nine, five were Europeans and four Indians; on the denominational division, two were ex-Anglicans, three ex-Methodists, and four ex-S.I.U.C. The presentation was followed by a Greek litany; then came the examination of the bishops-elect by Bishop Jacob, the presiding bishop. The first question required them to subscribe to an unimpeachably Trinitarian formula, making specific mention of the Incarnation; another question required them to promise to "banish and drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word"; another, introducing, so far as I am aware, a new and welcome element in such examinations, asked: "Will you do all in your power to foster and promote the preaching of the Gospel to all the people, both in your diocese and beyond its borders? And will you continually recall both ministers and people under you to their duty of witnessing to others in accordance with the command of our Saviour?" Another question concerning worship is worth quoting: "Will you diligently acquaint yourself with the various forms and methods of worship used in your diocese, and so advise the ministers and congregations committed to your charge that this Church may offer such worship as will be worthy of God's majesty and love, and a witness to those around them?"

The "Veni Creator" immediately followed this, and then the consecration of the nine bishops-elect. The chief consecrator was Bishop Jacob, bishop in Central Travancore[1]; he was assisted by the bishop in Madras and the bishop in Tinnevelly, and also by three presbyters from each of the other two uniting churches. The formula of consecration was quite unambiguous: "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands: in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." After consecration each new bishop was given a Bible, with the injunction to "Give heed unto reading, exhortation and teaching." Finally, he was also given his pastoral staff, with the charge to be a shepherd to the flock of Christ. Thus the three elements in the episcopal office—authoritative, teaching and pastoral—were all included. After the consecration of bishops, the Communion Service according to the 1662 Prayer Book was proceeded with. Nearly everyone in the cathedral and in the annexe communicated.

In the evening a large public meeting was held in connection with the inauguration. It was remarkable for the speeches of the delegates from other parts of Christendom who had come to Madras to attend the inauguration as representatives of their various churches. At this meeting also were read out messages of greeting from many different parts of the world. These included messages from the Archbishop of Canterbury, and from several bishops and dioceses in the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon. There was also a most friendly and welcome message from the secretary of the S.P.G., sincerely regretting that his society still had misgivings about the scheme of union, but assuring us of their real desire for union and their prayers. To the great disappointment and surprise of many of us, the Metropolitan of All India sent neither representative nor message.

Both because I have been only a short time in the country, and because so much is already being written about the union, it may seem presumptuous on my part to offer any comments on the situation out here, but perhaps anything I have noted may be of some value simply as being the impression of someone coming from outside. Before I left England I had heard quite a lot about the loopholes left for heresy and unorthodoxy in the Basis of Union. I must say that I have certainly failed to observe any tendency in that direction amongst those whom I have met; on the contrary, those who are most convinced of the necessity and benefits of union are those who are most concerned to preserve and defend the full Christian faith. The two inauguration services, for example, were obviously drawn up by men who had no reservations whatever about accepting the Nicene Creed and the centrality of the Eucharist in worship. If there is unorthodoxy and modernism in the South India Church (and I suppose there is a certain amount, though certainly not as much proportionately as in the Church of England), the union will do

[1] Bishops in the South India Church are to be described as "Bishop in Travancore," "Bishop in Tinnevelly," etc.

nothing to encourage it; rather the reverse, in fact. I have heard the fear expressed that the Congregationalist element in the United Church may be on the side of modernism, but again the actual situation does not seem to confirm this. The lay element is influential and vocal in Congregationalism, and in South India, as everywhere, the laity tends to be conservative, not modernist and innovating in its theological outlook. Ex-Anglicans may therefore find themselves in disagreement on some theological issues with their ex-S.I.U.C. fellow Christians, but the disagreement will be on "catholic" versus "evangelical-fundamentalist" lines (a divergence sufficiently familiar within Anglicanism), and not on orthodox versus modernist lines. On the other hand, I have been very much impressed with the very genuine desire that I have frequently heard expressed by former non-Anglicans for the things which the formerly Anglican part of the United Church is bringing to them. The ex-Methodists, for example, are genuinely glad to have a bishop; I have heard ex-Congregationalists say quite openly that they need episcopal government to discipline their rather too loosely knit system of church government. In the same way, the Prayer Book and many of the ceremonies and customs connected with bishops are being gladly welcomed by those who have not met them before. Some of this, of course, may be a little superficial. For instance, when the overwhelmingly ex-Methodist diocese of Medak was enthroning its bishop it was careful to omit no ceremony, such as the knocking on the cathedral door, traditionally connected with the enthronement of a bishop. But the matter goes deeper than this: an ex-Methodist church in the Medak diocese has planned to have a confirmation service shortly after the inauguration, at which the new bishop will confirm the candidates by the laying-on of hands. Another point of great significance in this connection, which I learnt only recently, is that the Conference of the English Methodist Church has decided that in future all new Methodist missionaries going to South India will be sent out unordained and will be ordained in the Church of South India. This will certainly help materially towards the solution of the question which this church must decide at the end of the thirty-year period—namely, whether to continue to accept occasional non-episcopally ordained missionaries, or not. Perhaps this points a way towards the complete solution of the problem.

I have said nothing about what ex-Anglicans can learn from the other two traditions. This is not because I think we have nothing to learn. On the contrary, the more I see of the others, the more convinced I am that they have a great deal to teach us, especially perhaps in the art of living as Christians in India. But what we have to learn from them is much less on the surface and will take a longer time for us to discover, while the ex-Anglican contribution is plain for all to see. The significant fact is that there are many in the Church of South India who are most ready to try to understand, and probably adopt or at least adapt, what we have to give, *if we will explain it to them* in terms both of the Bible and of common sense. It is, in a way, a test of our own conviction about the genuine worth of Anglicanism. Here are people who are sympathetic, but we must be able to explain

ourselves, and we must be willing to be patient, and to be content that what we believe to be true and good should be accepted by others bit by bit, not *en bloc*.

Something must be said about the dissentients to the union scheme. There are, as far as I know, only two places where more than an isolated congregation has expressed a desire to stand out of the union scheme. One of these is in the Cuddapah area, where part of a S.I.U.C. Church Council still has objections to coming into the United Church.[1] I do not know the details of this situation, but there seems no doubt that it is fundamentally a dispute concerned with persons, not with theological principles. The other dissentient area is of greater concern to Anglicans; it is the district round Nandyal, where the S.P.G. has worked for nearly a hundred years. This district marches with a London Missionary Society area, and in the distribution of dioceses in the United Church many of the ex-Anglicans there would find themselves in the same diocese with ex-S.I.U.C. Christians. The movement against inclusion in the union began after the decision of S.P.G. on May 8th not to support the Church of South India became known in India. The movement calls itself "The S.P.G. Orthodox Union," and its leaders say that they cannot conscientiously accept the Basis of Union. They use all the stock arguments against the union with which we have become familiar in the pages of *The Church Times* and elsewhere. They claim the signatures of something over 20,000 of the 40,000 "S.P.G. Christians" in the area. Until recently it was almost entirely a lay movement. Of the clergy in that area all but three or four signed assent to the Basis of Union. Recently, however, a number of clergy have indicated their desire to retract their signature, seeing that if they do not do so they will in many cases have no people to minister to. I think it would be true to say that these clergy at least would not profess to have any conscientious theological scruples about union, but wish to retract because otherwise their position seems intolerable. As is unfortunately the custom in India, even among Christians, violent and abusive language has been used on both sides and the usual paraphernalia of petitions and counter-petitions has been employed. To pronounce an opinion on the motives behind this movement is hazardous, since they are being denounced by some here as wicked schismatics, and applauded by others in England as Anglican martyrs; but I may as well record my own opinion that the movement is not really motivated by theological conviction about the wrongness of the union scheme. It began too late for that; if its promoters had really felt strongly about the unsoundness of the Basis of Union, they would not have waited till June, 1947, to voice their convictions. There are, I believe, two main motives behind it, both of them very understandable under the circumstances. One is a traditional loyalty to S.P.G.: "If S.P.G. can't approve the scheme, neither can we." And, of course, it is very difficult not to believe that the uncertainty of the financial future for those "ex-S.P.G. Christians" who enter the union has been a factor

[1] Well before the inauguration another Church Council of the S.I.U.C. elected to stay out, but the difficulties in Cuddapah have arisen subsequently to that.

in the minds of some. S.P.G. has not yet (October, 1947) decided to support the dissentients after 1947, but who can be blamed for thinking it very likely that they will if they stick to their declared policy of May 8th? It must be confessed also that there is a not very happy tradition of S.P.G.-L.M.S. rivalry which would naturally come to the fore at a time like this. The other underlying motive behind the dissentient movement is, I believe, connected with personalities, and I am not sure that this is not the stronger motive of the two. Those in authority in this new diocese have yet to show that they are capable of allaying the apprehensions and winning the confidence of these widely divergent groups of people.

What has been done about this situation? Both sides have accused their opponents of using coercion, but one thing is beyond doubt. Throughout the dispute the bishop in Dornakal (Bishop A. B. Elliott), in whose diocese the Nandyal area lay until September 27, has shown the greatest moderation. He does not conceal his distress that so many Anglicans should hesitate to enter the union, but he has consistently refused to coerce anyone. At the moment congregations composed of dissentients are being ministered to by those few clergy who have not signed assent to the Basis of Union and by a number of retired clergy in the district who are not required to sign. Very shortly a commission of six, three of whose members have been appointed by the Metropolitan, is to visit the area and see what can be done to settle the situation. It is very much to be hoped that some sort of compromise will be arranged by them. The one disastrous course would be for S.P.G. to continue to support the continuance of this Anglican enclave, missionaries and all, in the midst of the Church of South India, under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan or a North Indian diocese. It would make the position of ex-Anglican missionaries within the Church of South India almost intolerable, and would seem to make complete nonsense of Anglicanism. If the Church of England could send priests out to work side by side in rival churches in the same area, which are out of communion with each other, then indeed the comprehensiveness of Anglicanism would have deteriorated into sheer individualism. The coexistence of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon in North India with the Church of South India would not be a true parallel to this situation, since the two churches are not working in the same area; the C.I.B.C. has ceded jurisdiction in South India to the Church of South India.

However, much as we may dislike the idea of experimenting with the Church, the union scheme must be looked on as an experiment. The anomalies of denominationalism in the "mission field" were bound in the end to bring about some such scheme. This is the first attempt, and as such is likely to be exposed to that process of trial and error to which all first attempts are liable. It is as well to remember, also, that not all the mistakes which the operation of the scheme involves are being made in India. Some may be made (perhaps are being made) in England. We have in this Church the essentials; we have scope for improvement, and we have genuine goodwill—more than that, genuine love and faith. Nor should we

forget the likelihood of a similar scheme being put into operation in North India: the negotiations are already beyond the tentative stage. Such an eventuality would put Anglican enclaves in South India into a very difficult position. Above all things, I would appeal to anyone who really cares for a catholic Christianity in the non-party sense of the term to work hard to send *more* Anglican missionaries to the Church of South India. If S.P.G. is not blind to the realities of the missionary situation in South India, it will find some way of continuing to support missionaries working with the Church of South India and of sending more out. There is not the slightest likelihood of anyone preventing us teaching sound catholic doctrine, and there are many ready to learn.

ANTHONY HANSON.

DORNAKAL,
SOUTH INDIA.

"The Seal" in the Second Century

WHEN Dr Oulton's article on "Second-Century Teaching on Holy Baptism" appeared in the March THEOLOGY I was in America, and I have only just (September 28, 1947) seen this informed and scholarly criticism of my Oxford lecture on "The Theology of Confirmation in relation to Baptism." I must apologize to him for the apparent discourtesy of leaving it so long without comment. Perhaps I may still be allowed to outline an answer to his main points, since the topic seems to be still before the Church.

1. I do not think one can usefully study the second-century terminology of initiation in such isolation from first-century usage as he tries to do. Behind the N.T. evidence and terms there admittedly lies the liturgical *practice* of the Apostolic Church, and behind this again there lies the Jewish practice and terminology in the admission of proselytes. This latter consisted of (*a*) "The Seal" of circumcision; (*b*) "The Baptism" in water, or washing "in the Name of God"; (*c*) the offering of a sacrifice. These followed in sequence; all three were held to be necessary, and until all were completed the proselyte was not yet accounted an "Israelite" (*e.g.* he could not partake of the Passover). "The Seal" was regarded as his actual admission to the Covenant; "the Baptism" was for the removal of the Levitical "uncleanness" incurred by his previous pagan life; the offering of his burnt-offering (a dove) was looked on as his initial participation in the divinely ordered Covenant-worship and Covenant-relation of the People of God. Yet this complex of rites was treated as a single whole, and the effect of each part separately was not always nicely distinguished, and technical terms could on occasion be loosely used. The whole rite could be called "the Sealing" or "the Baptism" of the proselyte. His initiation as a whole could be termed his "Circumcision," without any notion of dispensing with his Baptism. (Thus St Paul can testify to the Galatians that he that is "circumcised" is bound "to do the whole law," though in the Jewish ritual it was only in the act of "Baptism" that the proselyte formally undertook "the yoke of the law.") Two Jewish documents (at least) speak of "the

water" specifically as "the Seal," though in the normal Jewish usage, as in St Paul, "the Seal" is specifically the Circumcision, and the water is "the Baptism."

I submit that when we find in Syria and in Asia Minor a second-century Christian rite of initiation, consisting of (*a*) "the Seal of the Spirit," (*b*) "Baptism" in water "in the Name of" Jesus or the Holy Trinity, (*c*) the proselyte's oblation at the Eucharist, we are obliged to take notice of the Jewish as well as of Christian evidence in considering not only the derivation but also the form and terminology, as well as the meaning of the Christian rite (in the last case, of course, with careful discrimination).

It is true that most churches soon reversed the Jewish order of (*a*) and (*b*) in conferring the rites. But St Paul's O.T. analogy for Christian initiation suggests that *circa* A.D. 50 the Gentile churches still followed, or at least understood, the Jewish order. "All our fathers were under the cloud and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea" (1 Cor. x, 1, 2). The "cloud" is the *shekinah*, a common alternative expression with the rabbis for "the Holy Spirit."[1] The duality of the rites of "the Baptism of the Spirit" and "Baptism of water" is clearly alluded to by St Paul in this passage, though they are linked closely in sequence. And they are in the Jewish order. I note that Prof. T. W. Manson has recently explained "the Spirit and the water and the blood" of 1 John v, 7 as another N.T. instance of the same order of the rites (and, I would add, of the duality of "the Spirit" and "the water") and drawn attention to a Christian interpolation in the *Testament of Levi* (viii, 4, 5) which illustrates the same order and the same duality: ". . . anointed me with holy oil, and . . . washed me with pure water and fed me with bread and wine, the most holy things. . . ." I would say that the same duality (and in some cases the same order) is recognized in other parts of the N.T. also, even where the word *βάπτισμα* is used to cover both parts of the single initiation, as in 1 Cor. x, 2. And things like the "Sealing" of the servants of God "in their foreheads" (Rev. vii, 3) need to be taken into account as possible links in the chain of evidence between pre-Christian Jewish practice and the liturgical rites of the Church as we first find these described in the later second century. The argument that the latter are actually based upon metaphors in N.T. passages breaks down before the fact that the N.T. documents were not recognized as "inspired" or "Scripture" before a period at which it is certain that the main elements of the liturgical rites were already in Christian use. The worship of the Church could not be *based upon* allusions in a N.T. which as such did not yet exist. It derived in reality from an authoritative tradition of *practice* which stretched back in unbroken continuity to the Apostolic age (though that is not to say that it did not receive additions or alterations in the period from *circa* A.D. 50-150.

[1] *Cf.* LXX. Isaiah iv, 3-5, where "the cloud" is associated with "the Spirit of judgment" to be given when "the Lord shall wash away the filth of the sons and daughters of Sion," and all "the remnant" that "are written for life in Jerusalem shall be called *ἅγιοι*."

The question of the extent to which it did so is precisely the question at issue, in this as in other cases).

What we badly need at the present time is a review of the N.T. evidence, in detail and as a whole, in the light of *all* the Jewish evidence. It is disappointing to find that the opportunity of doing this was largely missed in Dr Rawlinson's recent pamphlet on *Christian Initiation*, while my own former attempt in a paper called *Confirmation or the Laying on of Hands?* (S.P.C.K., 1s. 3d., now out of print) is too cursory to be conclusive.

2. To turn to the second century: I do not think it is surprising in view of the looseness of Jewish and first-century Christian usage of terms to find that some second-century Christian writers still use the same terms with the same looseness—*e.g.* that Hermas (*Sim.* ix, 16, 4) says that "the Seal is the water," or that Clement Al. (or his source) should term the whole rite "the Seal," or that others call the chrismation a "Baptism" of the Spirit. Their terminology is not rigidly fixed. What is constant is their *doctrine*—viz., that baptism in water bestows remission of sins and incorporation into Christ, but *not* the gift of the Spirit. That is imparted by "the Seal," properly so called, whether conferred before or after baptism. Since Dr Oulton cites from Irenæus (*Dem.* 3) an illustration of "the Seal" clearly used for baptism in water, let me illustrate the point from him. Irenæus goes so far as to explain the carnal mind of the Corinthians by the statement that at their baptism St Paul had deliberately refrained from laying his hands on them because of their spiritual immaturity, and so these baptized converts had not received the Spirit at all.[1] I hold no brief for Irenæus's history here, but at least his doctrine is clear enough.

3. But Dr Oulton claims that "the two second-century descriptions of Holy Baptism we possess, in the *Didache* and in Justin Martyr . . . describe a rite of water baptism complete in itself. . . ." The last three words seem to me a precarious inference from the evidence. There are good reasons why we should not have expected either account to describe "the Seal," even if the authors were acquainted with the rite.

The *Didache* professes to be a manual for the guidance of the laity, and elsewhere gives detailed directions only for rites which the laity can perform in the absence of the clergy (*e.g.* the Agape, ix and x). It passes over rites beyond the competence of the laity either in complete silence (*e.g.* ordination, xv) or with a mere allusion (*e.g.* the performance of the liturgical eucharist, xiv). I note that the *Didache* does not call its water baptism "the Seal" or suggest in any way that it conveys the gift of the Spirit.

Justin, in his *Apology*, is setting out to answer the popular charges against the Christians, including the dangerous charge of "Magic" (*Apol.* xiv and xxvi). His whole account of the Christian rites is skilfully adapted to demonstrate the harmlessness of these rites from the point of view of the charges brought against them, and is less naive than it appears on the surface. To suggest that every Christian at his

[1] *Hær.* iv, 63, 1; ed. Harvey, ii, p. 294.

initiation received what any Roman examining magistrate would take for a "familiar spirit" was not the best means to his end, and Justin omits all mention of "the Seal." But that something has been left out from his account of initiation is indicated by the fact that in his detailed explanation of the spiritual effects of baptism in water he restricts them to regeneration and remission of sins (*Apol.* lxi) and refrains from any suggestion that it imparts the Spirit. Yet Justin knows of the "Baptism of the Spirit," as he reveals in the *Dialogue with Trypho.* But he knows, too, that this is received only in the analogy to the *whole* Jewish initiation, and that this is twofold: "What have I to do with circumcision, who have been witnessed to by God? What need have I of that [Jewish] baptism who have been baptized with Holy Spirit?" (*Dial.* xxix).

4. Dr Oulton's documented study of second-century uses of the term "the Seal" is unfortunately incomplete. The first document I looked at to see if I could supplement it yielded the following: "Whoever shall hear you and believe on Me shall receive of you the light of the Seal through Me, and Baptism through Me" (*Epistola Apostolorum* 40, from Asia Minor *circa* A.D. 160—or, more probably, earlier). This is the Asian order. I had forgotten this case, and—if my memory serves me—there are others also, but I have not the texts at hand. Dr Oulton's reference to Melito of Sardis, *On the Passion* (ed. Bonner, p. 95) should be accounted a witness to the use of "the Seal" for chrismation, not for water baptism. The text of Exod. xii, 22 was used by other writers with the same alteration of the original *βάψις* to a *Χρῖσμα.* (*Cf.* Hippolytus, *Ap. Trad.* xxxvii, 3; Origen, *Sel. in Exod.* xii, 7; xii, 22; Pseudo-Chrysostom, *On the Pascha*, 1 (*ap.;* Chrysostom, *Opp.*, Paris 1836, *t.* viii, 934 D.); *ibid.* ii (937 A), where it is carefully explained why the "anointing" of the door-posts at Passover is the type of the unction of "the Seal"; and *ibid.* iv (945). I should add that this work, if not by Hippolytus, as I used to think, is of about his date, since it is cited by Origen. The same interpretation is found in Nazianzen, Proclus of Constantinople, and later writers.) No doubt the Paschal associations of initiation produced this curious adaptation of the text of Exodus. But in view of all these parallels there is no need to resort to conjectural emendation of the only available (Coptic) text of Melito, which actually reads *χρίσετε* here, in order to transfer his three references to "the Seal" from chrismation to water baptism. This use of "the Seal" in Melito and *Epist. Apostolorum* casts light on the instance cited by Dr Oulton from the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, since all are of about the same date, from Asia Minor and orthodox (even if Quartodeciman).

Dr Oulton seems to question whether Hippolytus actually terms the rite we should call "Confirmation" in *Ap. Trad.* xxii "the Seal." To explain his usage, let me add his reference to "the Spirit from heaven wherewith they that believe in God are *sealed*" after "the laver of regeneration that renews holiness" (*de Antichristo* lix), and "the oil, which is the power of the Holy Spirit, wherewith the faithful are anointed as with myrrh after the laver" (*In Dan.* i, 16).

For these and other reasons I must respectfully dissent from the suggestion that "the use of the term 'Seal' as applied to Holy Baptism

. . . underwent a change towards the end of the second century." Compared with Dr Oulton I am little better than an amateur in these studies, in which he has long been rated a master. But I cannot candidly say that the evidence, considered as a whole, seems to me to justify any such conclusion. We might agree that the loose use of the technical terms of the liturgy of initiation found in Jewish and Christian writers in the first century A.D. lasted on through the second and even the third centuries; but the discussion really concerns something much more important than the use and abuse of liturgical terms in the early Church. It concerns the very nature and scope of Christian initiation, with all the unavoidable implications this question must have for our doctrines of the Church, of the Christian life, of Episcopacy, and even of the mode of Christian salvation. It has practical implications too, for the teaching and pastoral ministry of the clergy to-day, for the problem of reunion and many other aspects of Church life, as has been becoming clearer in these last few years.

Dr Oulton is professedly seeking justification from the primitive Church (as he has every right to do) for "the affirmations concerning the Holy Spirit . . . found in the several Baptismal Offices of the Anglican Communion." I can and do honour such *pietas*, the more because—if I read him aright—he is anxious to maintain the fullness of that doctrine of baptismal regeneration, which has seemed to be threatened, or at least obscured, by some contributions to the public discussion on Baptism and Confirmation which has been proceeding among us for the last two years or so. Since I have been assigned some responsibility for the turn this discussion has taken, through the publication of a lecture, I hope it will not seem presumptuous if I take this opportunity to make my own position, as at present informed, quite plain. I have tried during these last eighteen months to study carefully, and I hope with docility, the large variety of criticisms, informed and less informed, which my historical conclusions have received from a surprising variety of quarters. There are a number of incidental points (some of them in Dr Oulton's article) on which I am glad to acknowledge correction, and there may well be other evidence which I have misunderstood or do not yet know. But, so far as I am able to judge, the main substance of the historical thesis set out in my lecture on "The Theology of Confirmation in Relation to Baptism" has not been effectively challenged (except by Dr Oulton, to whom I have here presented a reply). And since the appeal of Anglicanism is to Scripture as interpreted by the primitive Church and sound learning, this means that the theological conclusions I have drawn (and in which I have been joined by a number of theologians of weight)—viz., that *Confirmation is essentially eschatological and initiatory* in meaning—demand serious attention.

I will summarize the position which I personally hold, in order to submit it once again for correction and criticism by those who may be kind enough to offer it.

1. In Holy Baptism we receive regeneration, forgiveness of sins, original and actual, and incorporation into Christ and His Mystical Body the Church, as the Scriptures and the ancient Fathers and

Catholic bishops teach. (This, surely, is not to "depreciate" Baptism, as certain Anabaptist and Roman Catholic critics of mine do falsely boast.) It is a most mighty operation of God's grace, freely offered to all who sincerely fulfil the one requirement of the Church—faith, which includes repentance, renunciation of the devil and all his works, and hearty adherence to the whole revelation of God in Christ, as summarized in the Baptismal Creed. Infants may fulfil this requirement by Christian sponsors, but where it is not adequately fulfilled in some way the sacrament cannot be administered without profanation.

2. But the N.T., rightly understood, does not teach that the Sacrament of Holy Baptism is by itself the rite of Christian initiation. This consists of Baptism, Confirmation *and* First Communion (to use our modern terms), and without the two latter is incomplete. In saying this I prescind altogether from all questions of the *articulum mortis*, invincible ignorance, the death of catechumens, the uncovenanted mercies of God, and so forth. Nor do I intend to draw any inferences, positive or negative, concerning those in the anomalous position of being baptized but unconfirmed Christians through disbelief in the Apostolic ministry of bishops. *Deus non alligatur sacramentis.* I am simply stating the norm, as I think I find it enunciated in the N.T. and the practice of the pre-Nicene Church.

3. As at present informed, I think that St Jerome was the first Christian author to teach *ex professo* that baptism of water alone, without "the Seal" in some form, imparts the gift of the Holy Ghost—a doctrine which he bases solely on an interpolated text of Acts viii, 39. I think that no Christian authority can be fairly cited from the second or third century for this view.

4. I think that the medieval Latin teaching, largely embodied in our Prayer Book Offices, that Baptism of water by itself is a complete Christian initiation and that Confirmation is only a very desirable "augment" of baptismal graces, is the product of a theological confusion caused by abuses prevalent in the Dark Ages, which was systematized and spread in Western theology by the Forged Decretals.

It is for the Archbishops' Advisory Commission of theologians and the Joint Committees of Convocation, who are at present exploring the question, to declare the practical effects which ought to be given to the theological principles that underlie the pastoral practice of the Church in administering these sacraments. But I will venture to reassert that the authentic principle is that Confirmation is a *necessary* part of initiation, since it is the sacramental bestowal of the *positive* principle of Christian life, the gift of the Holy Ghost. Baptism of water is equally necessary, as we all affirm in the Creed, "for the remission of sins", and especially for the tragic and universal fact of "original sin." But it is in itself (in normal cases) radically incomplete without its positive complement of Confirmation and its fulfilment in the Communion of the Christian Sacrifice.

Gregory Dix, O.S.B.

The Prospects and Principles of Prayer Book Revision—I

PROSPECTS

I. *Division, Disorder, and Complacency*

Not even the most ardent advocate of Prayer Book revision could delude himself into thinking that the Church of England is eagerly and impatiently demanding it. On the contrary, the general attitude in all sections of the church is one of uneasy apprehension, for a variety of reasons. The contemporary Church of England is usually regarded as a comprehensive body which is composed of catholics, evangelicals and liberals. It is obvious, however, that these terms cover a confusion of ideas, and that even when they are precisely defined they apply to sections which overlap. It is at once simpler and more exact to find the clue to our divisions in the single word "Rome," and to recognize that four hundred years after the opening of the Reformation struggle in this land the Church of England is composed of a pro-Roman party, an anti-Roman party, and what may be called a non-Roman central group. There are those among us who accord the utmost deference to Rome, delighting to conform to its standards of faith and practice, though withholding their formal obedience. At the opposite pole there are those who have an intense dislike of Rome and a deep-rooted mistrust of everything that seems to be in any way connected with it. And, once more, there are those who are neutral in their attitude, moved neither by affection nor by hostility, but viewing the Church of Rome with a detached and somewhat critical respect.

The pro-Roman party is a reactionary phenomenon which first appeared in the year 1838, and is now grown to a considerable size. By a complete *volte face* it repudiates the principles of the Anglican Reformation; it condemns the "provincialism" of the Church of England, within which it nevertheless continues to live; and it looks to Rome of the Counter-Reformation, with which it does *not* live, as the real home of catholicism. The Tractarian Movement was but five years old when the forerunners of this party appeared within it. These, to quote Dr F. L. Cross, displayed "a willingness to accord a definite supremacy to the Roman See, a distrust of the Reformation, a belief in the possibility of corporate reunion with Rome, and a love for Roman Catholic ceremonial forms."[1] The movement declared against them, and they seceded to Rome. But the successors of the Tractarians developed their very modest revival of ceremonial for the more worthy performance of the rites of the Book of Common Prayer; and through that channel pro-Romanism came in once more. From a seemingly harmless borrowing of Roman ceremonial there has been an inevitable advance to the adoption of parts of the Roman rite, and so to the profession of the almost complete Roman version of the catholic faith. Inevitable, because there is an interdependence between creed and rite and ceremonial which compels such progressive conformity sooner or later.

[1] F. L. Cross: *The Tractarians and Roman Catholicism*, p. 61.

This party has never favoured the official revision of the Prayer Book for obvious reasons; and when the 1928 book was rejected by the House of Commons it rejoiced in a great deliverance. As Bishop Henson caustically observed at the time, its members appreciated the fact that they had narrowly escaped "the unpalatable necessity of deciding their ecclesiastical allegiance." Since then their watchword has been "Back to the Prayer Book!" For the 1928 book, and anything of its kind, they have conceived something like an obsession of hatred and contempt. The Prayer Book of 1662, on the other hand, is spoken of with great respect. The reason lies partly in the undoubted merits of the book, but far more in the fact that its eucharistic liturgy is jejune and its daily office severely compressed, while its rubrical directions are never inconveniently detailed and are sometimes most conveniently indeterminate. "Catholic" requirements can be satisfied, according to taste, by supplementing the Prayer Book rites from Latin sources, silently or aloud, and by adding a full measure of Roman ceremonial, with a keen eye for the latest novelties. Bishop Frere, who deplored the illogicality of such fusions, to say nothing of the breach of order which they involve, knew only too well that he was faithfully declaring the mind of the members of this party when he represented them as saying, "We want no change, because, as it is, we can take it as we wish, and do as we like, omit anything that we please, and alter what we disapprove; and no one can complain, for obedience, as it is, is impracticable."

The anti-Roman party is as old as the post-Reformation Church of England; and it is rather apt to consider itself the only true descendant of the English Reformers and to exaggerate its size and importance. This delusion is unhappily supported by the party's ability to rally all the forces of Protestant prejudice which have found their home outside the Church of England, in the ranks of Nonconformity and in quarters where religious interests lie dormant until the cry of "No Popery" is raised. Generally speaking, this party is ill-informed in matters liturgical; its interest has never lain in that department of the church's life. Generally speaking, again, it has very confused ideas about the meaning of catholicism. It is unable to discriminate between catholicism and Roman catholicism—a point in which it is strangely at one with the pro-Roman party—and by its bitter opposition to Rome it conceives itself to be committed to the repudiation of catholicism as a system, and so to regard with prejudice and even with abhorrence everything that characterizes the catholic way of worship.

The rejection of the 1928 book was applauded by the anti-Roman party with an even greater degree of jubilation than was to be found among the pro-Roman party, for the course taken by the work of revision had proved a bitter disappointment. That work was enterprised largely with a view to the disciplinary termination of the lawlessness of the pro-Roman party, and the initial stages had raised high hopes among all Protestants. But as time went on it began to appear that concessions were being made to the law-breakers, and the cry arose that the book was being "de-Protestantized." Filled

with alarm at the prospect, the anti-Roman party summoned to its aid all available support, and secured the defeat of the church at the hands of the state. To-day this party desires above all things to be left undisturbed in the enjoyment of the fruits of its victory; but it is suspicious of the bishops, who illegally permitted the use of the rejected book, and it is ready to take action should a further threat of revision arise.

Experience has taught it to expect that revision, when it comes, will be in a catholic direction. As Bishop Henson pointed out, "When the work of the Reformers is reviewed to-day, it is found to be doubly defective. On the one hand it was too indiscriminating in its destruction of the older system; on the other hand, it was too closely conditioned by the inevitable limitations—intellectual, social, political —of its authors." Consequently, he considered, "revision will have both the character of a return to pre-Reformation procedure and that of a departure from ecclesiastical precedent. . . . The mere conservative, who idealizes the established system, and the mere partisan, whose only notion of Prayer Book revision is to sharpen the rubrics against opponents, can obviously contribute nothing to the process of revision, and will certainly find no satisfaction in its result." The anti-Roman party is well aware that the mind of the Church of England as a whole has not gone back since it gave its approval to the 1928 book. Therefore it does not desire Prayer Book revision, and will continue to move the previous question.

The third section, that of the non-Romans, is not a party at all. It is an uncircumscribed body, central to the Church of England, but reaching out towards the right hand and the left, and shading off into the two extremist parties. It includes a large proportion of those who would insist on the name of Catholic, the greater part of those who would prefer to be known as Evangelicals, and all who are content to be described as Anglican or Church of England, without further qualification. This comprehensive body has no intention of "going to Rome"; it has no intention of "going to Geneva"; nor has it any intention of trying to reduce itself to a state of rigid uniformity, because it knows itself to be the church of the English people, with a long history behind it to which it is tied, and with a special tradition and a particular witness to be maintained.

A considerable part of this largest section of the church is seeking to conform loyally to the bishops' direction that the 1928 book shall be regarded as the norm and present term of deviation from 1662. Some, indeed, appear to have gone far beyond this by constituting themselves the guardians of 1928, and insisting that it shall be accepted as the terminus of Prayer Book revision in our time. "In that book," they seem to say, "the process of revision must come to a halt; and we must all agree to abide by it before any further steps can be taken." Such an attitude suggests an unfortunate imperviousness to the scholarly criticism which has exposed the weaknesses of the 1928 book, and also a serious failure to appreciate the psychological reaction of many in the church to the defeat of 1928 and to the subsequent authorization of the book by the bishops. If there is one thing certain

about Prayer Book revision, it is that the 1928 book is not the end of the journey, but a landmark on the way.

A smaller part of this central body is unwilling to regard 1928 as more than an instalment of a thorough-going revision which should issue, they suppose, in a really modern Book of Common Prayer adapted to the needs of the atomic age. These do not, however, press for a resumption of the work, because they are already free to modernize the book as each thinks fit; and such individual revision has all the advantages of the bird in the hand compared with that bird in the bush which is the truly modernist Prayer Book the Church is not likely to provide.

With the rest there is the same general readiness to make the best of a situation which is admittedly unsatisfactory, but can by no means be described as irksome. 1662 is the legal book, but the law does not now think fit to emphasize the fact and enforce its use. 1928 provides some useful alternatives and additions, which have no legal status but may be used with impunity. And there are other books from which valuable material may be drawn according to need, with no more serious transgression of the law of the land than that which the bishops have themselves proposed in connection with 1928, the state meanwhile turning a blind eye to the consequences of the *impasse* which it has itself created. "Let us not be in any hurry, then," they say. "At a more fitting season revision will doubtless have to be considered once again. But for the present things are well enough; and on the whole we should prefer not to lose the liberty we now enjoy."

As for the bishops, heavily burdened with problems of organization, supply and administration, it would be strange indeed if they were found eager to undertake the very considerable additional labour and loss of time involved in the complete recasting of the church's liturgical worship. Moreover, memories of 1927 and 1928 are still vividly present, to wound and to deter. There may well be a fear that, as one of them has said, "A rift has opened between the Church of England and the general sentiment of the nation which threatens to engulf the establishment itself." It is evident, therefore, that they are exposed to a very strong inducement to adopt the policy of "letting things work themselves out a while longer," and to give their attention to other matters of urgent importance.

II. *Wherein lies the Urgency of Revision?*

Since, then, there is not only a general absence of enthusiasm for revision, but also a large measure of distaste for it, why, it may be asked, should anyone wish to revive the issue at this time? The answer is, briefly, that revision is urgently demanded (1) by the insufficiency of the now discredited 1662 book, which is nevertheless the only legal book; (2) by the existing state of liturgical confusion, which is robbing the church of both respect and self-respect and of the power to discharge its proper task; and (3) by the unprecedented need of the nation, whose church the Church of England still is.

1. The Book of Common Prayer is universally recognized as a book

of many excellences. But it was never "incomparable," though it was often so described; and for a long time past it has been seen that it must be adapted to modern needs. The Church of England is neither where it was nor what it was in 1662. It has outgrown the liturgical provision which was then made for it; and, though it does not clamour for a new book, it is in no doubt about the straitness of the place in which it is legally required to live. Practical inconveniences in the use of the book, critical considerations arising from a wider theological and ecclesiastical outlook, and a desire, born of the fuller knowledge of these days, to set the book unmistakably in line with the best liturgical traditions of the church at large—these things combine to demonstrate the necessity of revision and to deprecate further delay in resuming the interrupted work. There are errors to be corrected, weaknesses to be remedied, and omissions to be supplied.

The Prayer Book is in error in many places through an uncritical acceptance of the equal authority of all parts of the Bible and a failure to appreciate fully the supersession of Old Testament standards by those of the New. It provides for the substitution of psalms for Christian canticles in the daily office; it intrudes the decalogue into the eucharistic liturgy; it quite gratuitously relates Christian marriage to patriarchal practice; it enjoins upon the sick the acceptance of their sufferings either as a chastisement for their sins or as a trial of their patience, with no suggestion of its wider implications or of healing grace; and it makes divine wrath and condemnation the *motif* of the Commination, on the basis of a selection of Old Testament prohibitions, instead of presenting the appeal of the cross and the Saviour's positive summons to righteousness. In the psalter there is a most injurious retention of the cursing psalms for Christian use, apparently on the assumption that every worshipper will be able to evacuate them of their real meaning by the ingenuities of mystical interpretation; and there are very many errors of translation, as well as some passages which convey no intelligible meaning whatever, apart from all question of their relation to the original Hebrew text.

The weaknesses of the book may be seen in the lack of clarity which characterizes some of its more important rubrics; in its excessive use of exhortation, so dearly beloved of the Reformers; in the ponderous phrasing of the catechism, with its reminiscence of a bygone social order and its omission of some vital elements of Christian teaching; in the barrenness of its expression of the doctrine of the Communion of Saints; and, above all, in a eucharistic canon which is open to grave criticism in respect of its structure and of the theological foundation on which that structure is reared.

As to the inadequacies of the book, these are found in its failure to relate the whole of the calendar to the contents that follow, as directive and not merely prefatory; in the insufficiency of the occasional prayers, which were provided for use in a smaller world than that into which the book has survived; in the almost complete neglect of the fact that the church is divinely committed to missionary activity; in the inevitable silence of the book as to the existence of that wide fellowship of sister churches which is the Anglican Communion; in

the incompleteness of the provision made for the reconciliation of penitents; and in the total lack of special provision for the discharge of that ministry to citizens unattached to any religious body, for which the Church of England seems to have become responsible as the national church of the English people in an age of religious decline.

2. The second of the three factors which combine to demand the revision of the Prayer Book is the continued exposure of the Anglican clergy, as a body, to the charge of lawlessness and the increasingly grave consequences, to themselves and to the church in general, of their prolonged inability to keep the law. Not until the book is revised, and constitutionally and canonically adopted, can the clergy be delivered from the charge; and not until then can the church escape from the evils of its present state of grievous indiscipline.

While the charge of lawlessness has been levelled against some or all of the clergy for the past hundred years, there has been a very important change in the implication of the charge. When prayer book revision was first contemplated the lawlessness which it was intended to correct by that means was conceived as defiance of the bishops by a number of Romanizing clergymen, who were thereby defying the statutory authority of the state. The sole use of the Book of Common Prayer was enjoined upon the clergy by the law of the land; the bishops were the officers whose duty it was to see that that particular department of the law was obeyed; and the rest of the clergy were under obedience to the bishops, and through them to the state. That point of view is still possible to our Erastians, it would appear; but even they cannot have failed to notice the church's growing sense and outspoken assertion of its spiritual independence, and the new unity of the bishops and the rest of the clergy in stressing the liturgical authority of the church instead of the legal authority of the state. Lawlessness remains—is, indeed, increased—but it is now seen to be primarily against the church and only secondarily against the state, by virtue of that association of church and state which is the establishment.

It is therefore extremely ominous to note that relief is apparently afforded to the consciences of some of the clergy by this important change of emphasis, as though defiance of the church's authority is merely a domestic concern, and consequently less heinous than defiance of the authority of the state. Whereas it ought to be obvious, most of all to the clergy, that an even heavier burden is laid upon the conscience by this change. To endeavour to withstand the interference of the state in matters directly affecting the spiritual life of the church is not only excusable, it is most laudable. But to defy the church itself in matters which are, beyond all possibility of contradiction, the care and responsibility of the church is to invite rebuke and disciplinary action, and, if this is omitted, to threaten the stability and very continuance of the church.

Nearly a quarter of a century ago Archbishop Lang declared that "the licence in public worship which now prevails in many quarters has passed the limits of what is tolerable, or consistent with the self-respect of the church." In the same year Dr Temple referred to

"the state of chaos into which we have fallen." Five years later Bishop Henson proclaimed his fear lest the Church of England should become "a derelict in Christendom," and insisted that steps should be taken to put an end to its "entire lack of order and discipline." Since then matters have grown not better but worse. The extent of the lawlessness is greater, by the almost unconscious growth of the habit of lawlessness; and continuance in law-breaking has produced a widespread state of complacent acceptance of it as a necessary evil which is after all not nearly so bad as it was once thought to be. Four years ago the Dean of York summed up the situation with characteristic moderation when he wrote that "the sense of liturgy is fading amongst us"; and he gave it as his considered opinion that "the whole discipline of common worship is at stake." There is no escape from that judgment upon our present condition, except by recourse to fantasy. It deserves to be very seriously taken to heart by all who suppose that patient continuance in unchecked disorder is the sure way to the recovery of right values, corporate efficiency, and healthy stability. A church without an effective liturgy has gone a long way towards denying that it is a part of the catholic church. And it is to be feared that we are so far advanced in liturgical disorder as not to seem to care greatly whether the liturgy of our church is ever to unite us again in the dignity of a common worship in the truly catholic way. Unashamed individualism and congregationalism and the vogue of popular forms of service, not as supplementary to liturgical rites but instead of them, are threatening to remove us from our place and to make eventual recovery hazardous in the extreme if the forging of the necessary instrument of recovery is much longer delayed.

3. The third contributory factor in the demand for revision is the need to reaffirm the character and claims of the Church of England in the sight of all Christendom, and more particularly in the eyes of the English people, whose present spiritual condition is partly the cause of the church's weakness and partly its result. The serious decline of religion in our midst ought to make it quite impossible for the church to drift on indefinitely without a determined effort to gather up and direct all its forces. The spread of irreligion constitutes an inescapable challenge to the church; and the widespread interest aroused by the report entitled *Towards the Conversion of England* shows plainly that there are many who are eager to accept the challenge. But how can the church seriously declare its intention to work for the conversion of England until it has come to a common mind as to the nature of the society in which converted people are to be shepherded, and the meaning of the church membership to which they are to be invited to pledge themselves? And how can it now declare this except in terms of a revision of the Prayer Book which shall resolve the current diversity of interpretation and use, and by the authoritative issue of a book which shall definitely terminate these confusions? The Anglican standard of faith and practice is embodied in the Book of Common Prayer. A declaration of the contemporary church's mind concerning itself must therefore take the form of a

revision of that book; and the nation, which, like the church itself, is vastly different from what it was in 1662, has every right thus to learn from the established church its present conception of its character and purpose.

The assumed identity between English citizenship and Anglican church membership which has been read into the Prayer Book, though it is not really there, is now seen to be a fiction which deceives nobody and is disastrous in its consequences. Where, then, does the national church stand? If it is to continue to be known as the Church of England, it certainly cannot stand where the pro-Roman party would have it. There remain only three possible answers to the question; and one of the three ought to be made, as soon as the church's machinery admits of its formulation, in the most unambiguous terms. The first, which is instantly to be dismissed as a betrayal of all that our church has stood for throughout its history, is that it is the organ of a merely national religion, a department of the state which under state control ministers to the people in close accord with their political and social ideals, investing the corporate life of the people with such sanctity as belongs to the state embodiment of a common-sense and Pelagian tincture of Christianity. The second answer, which would be an equally gross betrayal, though it seems that it would not be so accounted by all, is that our church should expressly repudiate the Catholic basis of the Prayer Book, with its provision for the rule of faith, the threefold ministry, and the sacramental life, and substitute for it a purely Protestant foundation which would admit of its immediate fusion with the Free Churches in a comprehensive Reformed Church of England embracing every kind of Protestant in the land. If that answer is found to be impossible, as it certainly must be if any regard is had to continuity with the past, there remains only the third answer to the question. This is that our church is still, as it has been since the time of its reform in the sixteenth century, a part of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, determined to safeguard all the essentials of true Catholicity, maintaining its protest alike against Roman accretions and Protestant rejections where these are contradictory to the faith and practice of the early church, standing on its own feet in the land where it has lived out its past long history, abating nothing of its ancient position as *Ecclesia Anglicana*, and eager to commend the Christian Gospel and way of life to the English people. If the Church of England is not to come to an inglorious end by the way of indecision and procrastination, let it now prepare to give that answer, and to give it soon, in the form of a revised Book of Common Prayer.

III. *The Action to be Taken*

Two alternative courses are open to the church. The work of revising the book may be undertaken piecemeal or in a single operation. In either case it would seem to belong to wisdom for the bishops to appoint a Liturgical Commission and to entrust to it the work of preparation, reserving to themselves the duty of constant supervision and the right of acceptance or rejection or modification of the results

of the commission's labours before these are presented to Convocation. Such a commission would need to be fully representative of the church's traditions and scholarship and practical wisdom; and, while it is common form to-day to deny our sufficiency for the task of revision, it may nevertheless be safely assumed that as a church we are by no means so destitute of gifts as to make it presumptuous to set our hand to it. The *ad hoc* prayers which have been issued on national occasions in the past provide no real criterion of what the Church of England can do in such a matter; and as for the weaknesses of the 1928 book, it is to be remembered that that book was not the work of such a commission as is now suggested. We have not yet tried the experiment of working in that way for the revision of our liturgical rites, and the situation in which we find ourselves demands that we should now adopt it.

A Liturgical Commission which was given the task of revising the Prayer Book piecemeal would clearly have to continue in being for a very long time indeed, renewing itself on the way by the frequent infusion of new blood as its members dropped out through resignation or death. It would deal with the book section by section or service by service, and report periodically to the bishops, who would put out at intervals the work which they had approved and authorize its experimental use. At some far-distant date, when the whole book had been thus revised and all its parts approved and experimentally used, some of them referred back for change, amended, and tried again, until something approximating to general satisfaction had been reached, then at long last the book would be canonically adopted by the church, and the commission would have served its purpose.

This method seems to be finding favour with those who begin to be convinced that something must be done. There is some talk of the need of proceeding with deliberation, which is declared to be the characteristically English way, and so of avoiding a repetition of the untoward events of 1927 and 1928—as though there was something hasty and ill-considered about the making of the book that failed; whereas we have been told that "by 1925 everyone was weary of the protracted debates." The truth is, of course, that the piecemeal method is attractive only because it would take so long a time. But for that very reason it deserves to be rejected. Throughout the long period required for the completion of the task there would be a further growth of the present disorders, a prolonged and sometimes acute controversial distraction from the evangelistic and pastoral work of the church, and a steady diminution of the already small measure of the sense of liturgical obligation which still remains to us. At worst we should impatiently dissolve into two, or perhaps three, schismatical bodies, and the work of the commission would thus become superfluous. At best we should continue to be at variance among ourselves, and consequently incapable of discharging our proper duty as a church; and when the book finally emerged at the end of the commission's long travail, it would be little short of a miracle if it proved to be a real unity, bearing no very obvious marks of its piecemeal production by a commission which would have been in effect a

series of commissions drawn from several successive generations of churchmen.

The prospect of a long delay should be intolerable to a church whose present position has been declared by high authority to be itself intolerable. It would demonstrate our pusillanimity and expose us to the calamity of a dissolution of our corporate existence. We ought to be moved by a strong sense of urgency to take action at once, and to determine that by God's grace we will unite to claim our common heritage. A bold attempt should be made to accomplish the revision within a short term of years, keeping the whole book in view all the time as the unity which it now is, and thus to follow the precedent of previous revisions. If the commission were called into being and set to work with an injunction to apply itself to its task intensively, a maximum of five years might well be specified for the completion of the task. After experimental use for a further period of five years the Church could amend the revision where necessary, and then give it canonical approval and require its general adoption.

The question of parliamentary control can safely be put on one side as entirely irrelevant at this stage. What is needed, before that question is faced again, is the removal of fears and prejudices and the closer approximation of the different sections of the church in a common loyalty by an appeal to sound learning in the spirit of charity. Doubtless it is beyond the power of any commission to devise a book which shall give to each section of the church no more and no less than it would wish; but it is surely *not* beyond the power of a strong and really representative commission to draft a new book, better than 1662, better than 1928, because thoroughly adapted to our time and need, which shall so truly express the comprehensive genius of Catholic and Evangelical Anglicanism that it shall be acceptable to all but those who have stepped outside the Anglican tradition and are unwilling to retrace their steps, and shall assist the great majority in our church to a closer fellowship of life and worship than we have known for a hundred years and more.

O. Hardman.

(*To be concluded*)

Why You Should Read It—XI

The Life of Archibald Campbell Tait, Archbishop of Canterbury. By Randall Thomas Davidson, D.D., Dean of Windsor, and William Benham, B.D., Hon. Canon of Canterbury. In two volumes. Macmillan, 1891.

Read biography, m'dears. Read . . . Tait. The college tutor who delivered this injunction had no doubt as good a reason for it as, say, the writer of the celebrated letter, *Dear Mrs. B.,—Chops and tomato sauce.* There was nourishment there, and relish to his taste. And I cannot blame him, ascetic as he was, for bidding relish to his pupils' nourishment; the sparer frame needs cosseting. Nor then may I be blamed if, reader, I commend this dish to you.

Archibald Campbell Tait was born of Scots Presbyterian parents in 1811; he entered the University of Glasgow in 1827, and came south to Balliol College, Oxford, in 1830. He graduated in the year of Keble's Assize Sermon; he remained a fellow and tutor of his college until Newman had written, and the four tutors had censured, the last of the *Tracts*. In 1842, at the age of thirty-one, he succeeded Arnold at Rugby; after seven years he moved to the Deanery of Carlisle, where he lost five daughters to scarlet fever within a month. In 1856, when Temple was at Rugby, Hampden at Hereford and Gorham at Brampford Speke, he was called when still only forty-five to succeed Blomfield at London. A. P. Stanley named three men to him for chaplains—*Benson*, *Westcott*, *Lightfoot*—men *worth enquiring after*. (He appointed none of them.) For ten years he and Samuel Wilberforce divided the Anglican Communion between them, *quasi alterius orbis avunculi*, each counselling, leading, gathering halves of that which one or the other would some day rule entire. Tait was chosen. In 1868, when at the height of his unpopularity alike with the Church Association and the English Church Union, when his name was never mentioned in the *Record* or the *Church Times* but with foul abuse, he was called to the Primatial See of Canterbury, which he occupied until his death in 1882. His chief biographer, Randall Davidson, was his compatriot, his chaplain and son-in-law, his interpreter, his successor, after nineteen years, in St Augustine's chair. Understand A. C. Tait, then, his principles, his method, his mind, understand the position to which he raised the See of Canterbury in relation to the Anglican Church as it was then spreading abroad, and you will understand the directing genius of that Church from the eighteen-fifties to 1928, and perhaps beyond.

Readers of Theology will not be entertained with a bare recital of the major events and controversies of the nineteenth century, nor with a catena of anecdotes from its great men's lives. They will ask, What is the church historian's function in relation to theology? Why is he suffered, and indeed encouraged, to exist? It is his task, sometimes a melancholy one, to survey the field after the theologian has left it; he, coming after, sees the effect this or that dogma has had upon the church and men. And the effect of nineteenth-century theology upon the Church of England is at points profoundly startling. Furthermore, he must make clear to the theologian the situation in which the theologian is now thinking. We start our thinking from where we are; the historian says, Pause: how did you come where you are? Where did you derive your presuppositions? How old are they? Are they a product of the Gospel, or of the confusion of yesterday? Answer these questions before you justify what is, or expound what ought to be. And if this is his duty to the theologian, it is as much so to the ecclesiastical statesman and to governors in diocese and parish. Every age is an age of change, but change need not be drift. Our task is to determine what *were* yesterday's changes and how far they ought to shape to-day's. Some are factors of permanent value and significance; some are not—build not therefore upon them.

You should read the life of Tait, then, as a study in changes. And

first you will notice the change in men. We shall not meet, I think, as many *great* men, *characters*, nor in such diversity, in the pages of a contemporary biography of similar length; the very strifes then were conflicts of character. Is the cause a change in spiritual diet? Fathers do not write homilies to their sons as they were used. Tutors do not write to undergraduates, as Oakeley wrote to Tait, to enjoin, above all things, "the improvement of religious knowledge and feeling"; nor are tutors, at the age of twenty-six, counselled by contemporaries against ambition. Prayer comes less readily to men at their desks, at sick beds, with the joyful or the bereaved; letters of condolence or congratulation are thinner, more laboured, more self-conscious. The whole affectional nature is drier now: in joy and sorrow we keep to the plains, strangers to the peaks as to the abyss. Who now sees Christian anger? There is no thrill now in the public meeting, no intoxication of oratory, no stirring at great causes or for great occasions. The historian sees men changed; he thinks men, Christian men, less the men they used to be. At the same time he sees changes in their spiritual nourishment. Children's Bibles, children's eucharists, children's corners; shortened psalms, amended lessons, talks at sermon-time; communion more frequent, weekly, daily, without the old awe and discipline of the community in preparation. And he asks if these changes are not in some way connected; he looks to the theologian and the rest to give him an answer.

You will, of course, see changes in the church. Some, resisted then, most churchmen now approve or take for granted, the cost forgotten. Men challenged traditions received with traditions rediscovered and revived; both sides appealed confidently to the law; but the law was baffled, and confidence waned. Tait appeared to stand on the law at the expense of justice, rather than disown the law to prevent injustice; he was consistent in a changing situation, and therefore satisfied neither side. The resultant was a new tradition—a tradition of non-conformity replacing uniformity, and congregationalism the parochial system—at first without law, but now making its own law as custom hardens with every year. The historian asks the theologian to examine it now, before it sets too hard.[1]

What do we think now of a national church? Tait found at his coming here a conflict of opinions, a tradition being assailed. He found existing a national church, represented by an established church *plus* numerous orthodox Protestant sects, each dissenting from it for its own particular reasons (often wrong reasons), not conforming normally to its liturgy nor obedient to its discipline and order, yet not so far in schism as to be formally excommunicate or debarred absolutely from occasional communion at its altars. In its relations with the Presbyterian Church of Scotland and with Reformed Churches abroad he found it affirmative for itself, while refusing the logical negative for them; it would not unchurch them for not possessing what it was determined for itself to maintain; their members, too, were

[1] Dr. T. O. Wedel writes well of Anglo-Catholicism and tradition in *The Coming Great Church* (S.C.M., 1947), pp. 81, 99-107.

admitted to its communion while sojourning temporarily in England. This tradition the Tractarians were seeking to overthrow; Tait saw in it, until divisions should be healed, a mitigation to be maintained. His views are expressed clearly enough in an address delivered at a communion of the Y.M.C.A., of which Nonconformists were expected to partake, in 1857, and in a letter to Canon T. T. Carter upon the Revisers' Communion in Westminster Abbey in 1870.[1] The historian's verdict is that Tait was appealing to a valid tradition: it *was* novel to "regard the Kirk of Scotland as a synagogue of Baal"; it *was* novel to reject (Dean Stanley's) "Nonconformist member of the Establishment." Yet the new, the hardening tradition approves these novelties: the Tractarians and their successors have done their work well, and feeling has hardened, naturally, on the other side. We countenance now in England an Established Church together with Free Churches, and give ourselves thereby a new subject for contention, whether there is between them any difference or inequality; in the traditional relation the question could not arise. The priest who admits a dissenter to the communion now must needs feel himself an appeaser or a law-breaker; neither rôle contributes much to a charitable mind. Which tradition, then, has in it more promise of reconciliation? Are we now, theologian, to keep doors open or to shut them?

It *is* a scandal that the natural unity of nationality should be, not deepened by unifying grace but, shattered by ecclesiastical conflict. The nineteenth century had its fill of that. Tait's church would be no less national for being at once catholic and evangelical. The union of church and people for which Lowder and Mackonochie in their parishes gave their lives, Tait strove for at every level of the national life which he could touch. For him the connexion with the state must be effective and real. At a time when the colonial churches were deliberately breaking off their ties with the English crown, when many were seriously advocating the disestablishment of the church at home, and every crisis was thought to threaten it—the Gorham Judgment, Revised Subscription, the Athanasian Creed, even the innocent Burials Bill of 1880—Tait stood out for establishment as a vital principle.

[1] *Tait*, i, 253 *ff.*; ii, 68 *ff.* *E.g.*, upon the rubric of being "confirmed or ready and desirous to be confirmed": "I believe this rubric to apply solely to our own people, and not to those members of foreign or dissenting bodies who occasionally conform. All who have studied the history of our Church, and especially of the reign of Queen Anne, when this question was earnestly debated, must know how it has been contended that the Church of England places no bar against occasional conformity." Compare Dean Stanley's defence in Convocation, February 17, 1871, where he cites also the practice of Bishop Wilson (*Chronicle of Convocation*, pp. 261 *ff.*). The weightier memorials and the prolonged Convocation debates show that the primary objection was against the Unitarian admitted to the Communion, rather than the Orthodox Dissenters; and the question soon resolved into one whether he (together with the Roman Catholic) should have been invited to join the Revision Committee at all. Bishop Wilberforce, who (after a characteristic change of mind) moved for his exclusion from the Committee *because* he had communicated after remaining silent during the Nicene Creed, puts the distinction as clearly as anyone: "Now I do not propose to exclude this gentleman because he is a separatist from the English Church; but I do propose to exclude him because he is a denier of our Lord's Godhead" (*ibid.*, February 15, p. 87).

Also [he said] let this be considered, that if we once get into the way of speaking as if the secular authorities of the land were merely secular, as if their great and only business in Parliament were to make this a rich nation—a nation in which the outward symbols of wealth were to be seen on every side—then, I fear, we might come to a very low style of statesmanship. If men, when they enter that great Assembly which represents this Empire, were to consider only the things of this life, then, I fear, the Empire would soon go to decay.[1]

Is he justified by the event, or is he not? As touching the royal supremacy, exercised in the appointment of bishops and in the final appellate jurisdiction, he challenged the non-established churches to show from better methods better results if they could. Have they shown them? The cases of Long and Colenso against the Bishop of Capetown[2] are instructive here in view of the similar situation which might arise in England under canons cxii and cxiii, as I read them, of the proposed new code. How far forward, in fact, are we if a priest or bishop "who feels aggrieved for lack of justice or abuse of process . . . in an ecclesiastical court" appeals against its sentence to a civil court, and wins his appeal? Can the church escape division? Not all loyal churchmen will uphold the validity of an excommunication or a deposition compromised by confirmed injustice, and the result will be, if not a schism, at least an unseemly evasion by verbal subterfuge. Just such a case plunged the whole Anglican Communion into years of acrimony and confusion, from which we can but take good warning. The church may think Colenso's theology worthless enough, but not his obstinate stand on common justice and the law.

There is abroad in the church to-day a certain impatience of the establishment, born, not indeed of present provocation, but of humiliating memories emotionally magnified. There is talk in the air, and there is danger in it because it comes from men whom the church has learned on other grounds to cherish and admire. (Our reading should warn us against bad doctrines taught by good men.) We should take care, or we may some day pay a price out of all proportion to the little ends to be secured. The impugners of the royal supremacy whom we meet in *Tait* were not the Tractarian giants; they were, in general, the lesser men who deflected Tractarian tradition. Dr Pusey, grieved as only Pusey could be at the Judgment of 1850, wrote in his work on *The Royal Supremacy* in the same year:

The parting of the State from the Church is no light matter. To the State it is suicide. . . . The Church gladly accepts a rightful supremacy. To accept a wrongful one would be falsehood to the Crown itself. . . . [But] we have a sacred duty to the State [also], while we may lawfully render it. We should not, on every fresh offence of the Legislature, speak of the separation of Church and State. It is like the cry in the fable, "Wolf, wolf." If the Church eventually must so speak, let her speak, not through individuals, but strongly, definitely, in unmistakable earnest."[3]

---

[1] *Tait*, ii, p. 300.

[2] *Ibid.*, i, pp. 350, 362, 367-8.

[3] *The Royal Supremacy Not an Arbitrary Authority but Limited by the Laws of the Church, of which Kings are Members.* By the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D. (Oxford, 1850), pp. 208, 210-11. It is worth remarking that Pusey joined with Carter and other High

Dr Pusey and his friends have few representatives in the Church to-day; most of those who assume they follow him do not, and we who read *Tait* must tell them so. For we shall read on: we shall read Pusey, Keble, Lowder, Liddon, Blomfield, Thorold, Wilberforce; Maurice, Stanley, Creighton, Church; we shall move among the giants; we shall learn—pray God, we shall learn—in what seven locks the strength of the church lies. For we shall find no monopoly of truth, or piety, or zeal; but abundance of faith. *Ubi est fides Christi, ibi est Christus.*[1]

G. R. Dunstan.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Anthony Hanson is an S.P.G. missionary on the staff of Dornakal Divinity School, Deccan, India.

Dom Gregory Dix, O.S.B., is a member of Nashdom Abbey, Burnham.

Dr Oscar Hardman, formerly Professor of Pastoral Theology at King's College, London, is now Chaplain of St Monica's House, Westbury-on-Trym, Bristol.

The Rev. G. R. Dunstan is Sub-Warden of St Deiniol's Library, Hawarden.

BOOK REVIEWS

Dogmatik im Grundriss. By Karl Barth. Chr. Kaiser Verlag München. 5.40 RM.

This book consists of a series of addresses based on the Apostles' Creed and given at the author's summer semester in 1946 at Bonn University. Barth recognizes that some justification is needed for publishing yet another book of this kind; already two studies on the Apostles' Creed have appeared from his pen, the *Credo* published 1935, and the *Confession de la Foi de l'Eglise*, 1943. Yet the circumstances under which these addresses were given impart to them a quality which is all their own. The author was evidently deeply moved at revisiting the scene of his former labours and meeting old friends and students; and the sight of so many young "earnest faces which must learn first to smile again" clearly nerved him to give them of his best. Accordingly these discourses are suffused with a warmth and earnestness which the printed page has carefully preserved.

Since, however, the subject is "Dogmatics in Outline" Barth felt himself under the necessity of introducing the exposition with a brief but carefully worded discussion of the nature of Dogmatics. Dogmatics, he says, is a science whose active subject is the Church; for the purpose

Churchmen in welcoming the exclusion of the bishops as judges from the revised Final Court in 1875—a change brought about by Gladstone and Wilberforce against Tait's wish (*Tait*, ii, 267-70).

[1] St Thos Aq., *in 2 Cor. xiii*, 5.

of revelation is to summon forth a witnessing community whose task and responsibility must ever be to bring to a critical test the content of the proclamation which it is making to the world. This science will seem to differ from other sciences in that it has continually to begin afresh. In fact, the fundamental necessity of Dogmatics lies in the fact that the Church can err. On that account she must ever anew test her message by the standard of that original and regulative witness to the object which constitutes the ground of her life and activity in the world—namely, the witness of Holy Scripture. Moreover Dogmatics will ever be under obligation to pay heed to the classic creeds and confessions wherein the Church of the past has sought to make the original witness her own in times of challenge and contradiction. It will not attribute to these the binding authority which belongs to the witness of Scripture alone, but will recognize in them a leading and guidance for those decisions which the Church has to make here and now.

Further, the nature of the scientific undertaking is determined by the fact that while the object with which theology deals is a particular history, Christianity being an historical religion, it is a history which does not belong to the past alone, but enters into the present and presses forward into the future. In other words, that which takes place on the field of the particular history is the actualization in terms of time, and on behalf of men, of those eternal relations, decisions, and determinations which belong to the inner being of the Godhead and constitute that being as itself a history. Thus the best method for theology to follow will be the method followed by the Apostles' Creed, which treats of the external action of the Triune God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

But the Apostles' Creed is no mere document of theology. It is a confession of faith. It begins with the words "I believe." And these words imply a personal "meeting" of God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, with men; a meeting which draws men within the sphere of the relations and determinations of the divine being which are actualized externally on the field of time. Thus faith is a trust, a knowledge, and a confession: a trust, for which men will seek no "grounds" because it is a "freedom" conferred by this meeting; a knowledge, in which the reason is illumined by contact with the last truth and reality; and a confession, which can be no private affair, but which must be made in face of the world and lead to decisions in the affairs of public life.

From this background Barth sets out to expound the creed clause by clause, and sometimes almost word by word; and in so doing he demonstrates its relevance as "a document of our time." Attentive readers will be struck by the way in which the exposition appears continually to validate the background, while the background illumines the exposition.

This book is one of the best things which Barth has given us. Profound as the thought is, it is expressed in language so simple and direct that all may understand. And it is alive with the passion of faith and devotion. In fact we could call the book a devotional classic.

F. W. Camfield.

Kingsbridge.

MA JOIE TERRESTRE OÙ DONC ES-TU? Études Carmélitaines. Bruges, Desclée, De Brouwer et Cie. 1947. 380 pages. Fr. 120.

Few people will dispute the view, expressed more than once in this volume, that the present world has grown grey from the breath of its own secularism. Our joylessness is not merely a product of the post-war frustration which is on everybody's lips. After all, it was the prosperous nineteenth century that gave us in some of its moods our cries about "the weariness, the fever and the fret," "this strange disease of modern life with its sick hurry." The French-speaking Carmelites are right in tracing the trouble back into the activism and godlessness of a whole age; and they have done well to devote the present volume of studies to the theme covered by their engaging title. We are given some twenty-two such studies, historical, philosophical, theological and devotional, contributed both by the Carmelites themselves, and by professors and others in secular life. The underlying theme is the idea, of which St Francis of Assisi stands for most people as the supreme exemplification, that the joy of paradise, lost through pride and possessiveness, can be recovered through selfless devotion to Christ, so that a spiritual state is reached in which God and His creatures can be enjoyed with the innocence of true love, the natural thus becoming a vehicle of the supernatural in a regained earthly paradise. The general point of view is thus congenial to the ordinary English reader. He may feel at times that in the endeavour to avoid making joy a mere "sacristy word" one writer or another is in danger of preaching an abstraction which the plain man would not recognize as joy, or trembles on the brink of a Manichæan depreciation of the created world. But it is good for us to be reminded in the noble meditation of the young priest, Jean Massin, that stigmatization and selflessness are not words to use lightly: and if an extremely abstract view appears to be implied both in the interesting comparison of surrealism in art with the super-intellectual in mysticism and also in the impressive catena upon the "negative way" constructed by the Carmelites of Amiens from the writings of the mystics, still the corrective is constantly at hand. We dare not quarrel with the Carmelites for giving us an insight into their own high spirituality as the way of supreme joy: moreover the greatest nettle in creaturely joy is boldly grasped in a considerable section on sexual life in which both continence for the love of God and sanctified matrimony have their place. There is hardly any allusion to English work in the book: one could wish that here (as elsewhere) there had been some examination of Richard Rolle, with his message of *dulcor* and *canor*; and the English reader is given two chuckles of unsanctified glee in the two appearances of the opening line of *Endymion*, which has on p. 12 a footnote "Shelley" and on p. 126, referring to inanimate objects, appears in English as "things of beauty who are a joy for ever." Those who are far enough out of the fashion to care not only for the philosophy which goes in company with politics and economics but for that which walks with such humanities as æsthetic, and ascetic and mystical theology, will find pasture of a high quality in these pages. Perhaps one of the most attractive things in the book is the short anonymous account of the

Hospice of the Great St Bernard, in which, along with the life of study, contemplation and service, and its "wild peace," we are given a glimpse of the weekly outing of the brethren upon the mountains, and their prayer: Toi qui te fais encore notre nourriture dans l'humble sacrement, aide-nous à contempler l'œuvre de tes mains, à nous élever par elle jusqu'à toi pour t'aimer et te servir mieux.

BRECON. EDWARD SWANSEA AND BRECON.

THE NEW MODERNISM: AN APPRAISAL OF THE THEOLOGY OF BARTH AND BRUNNER. By Cornelius van Til. James Clarke. 20s.

We in Britain find it hard to understand the dialectical theology of Barth and Brunner because we live in a very different spiritual and mental climate from theirs. We do not feel their problems as our problems or their burdens as our burdens. The whole pattern of our civilization has not been shattered, as theirs has, by war and economic upheaval. Post-Kantian philosophy has not undermined our belief in reason and conscience, and we have not been driven to choose between nihilism and some form of existentialism. We were not brought up on a theology dominated by Schleiermacher and "the consciousness religion"; if Feuerbach laughs, we do not feel that he is laughing at us. If Barth and Brunner disagree with each other about the details of their erroneous views of the *imago Dei*, we do not get excited. We are insular; we live in a different world. *Cuius regio eius theologia.* We cannot see through the dialectical spectacles. Consequently we dismiss Barthianism or existentialism with a remark about passing post-war neuroses, and our complacency is undisturbed.

Dr Cornelius van Til, however, has taken the dialectical theology with great seriousness. He has scrutinized all the works that Barth and Brunner have ever written, as his ample documentation shows. Yet it would seem that from his window in the Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, U.S.A., the problems and anxieties of the dialectical theologians appear even more unreal and unintelligible than they do to us. He seems to be a Calvinist fundamentalist, and he does not see the problems of a world in which dialecticism and existentialism are the desperate and tortured answers that faith must grasp at to save itself from falling into nihilism and despair. He does not sympathize with Barth and Brunner because he does not understand the situation in which and from which they are trying to speak the word of faith. Hence he fails to give a fair statement of their position. There is also the further difficulty that his book is very heavy going, because he uses technical and highly ambiguous terms without pausing to tell us in what sense he is using them. He expounds Kant and Hegel, Kierkegaard and Heidegger, but one wonders whether anyone who knew nothing about these difficult thinkers would learn much about them from this book.

If Professor van Til had been more moderate in his statements, we should probably have found ourselves more in agreement with him. It is true that Barth and Brunner have not freed themselves from the relativism and scepticism of modern thought so completely as they

like to think. But one does not recognize Barth and Brunner in much of what is here written about them. Their withers will remain unwrung. Dr van Til's thesis is that "the theology of crisis is a friend of modernism and a foe of historic Christianity" (p. 378). Orthodox Christians must not be deceived by Barth's and Brunner's pretended attack on naturalism and phenomenalism and permit the wolf to enter their fold. Having swallowed the poison of the Kantian criticism, they are unable to escape from the historical relativism and psychological subjectivism of Schleiermacher and Ritschl, even though they have every intention of doing so. By the transcendence of God, Barth and Brunner mean only what the Kantian epistemology will allow them to mean: their "Wholly Other" turns out to be the "Wholly Similar" of Schleiermacher. By eschatology they do not mean future dates; by creation they do not mean an historical Adam in an historical paradise; by revelation they do not mean that God can be revealed in ordinary historical events; by predestination they do not mean that God has foreordained the salvation or reprobation of every individual soul . . . and so on. In short, Barth and Brunner, though they claim to have re-established the true principles of Reformation theology, do not teach what Calvin taught and have nothing in common with him except some forms of words. "There is perhaps no instance of greater intellectual confusion to be found in the annals of human error than that of the retention of orthodox Christian forms by a purely naturalistic theology such as Modernism is. It is as though carbolic acid were poured into water-bottles without a change of labels" (p. 371). Whatever we may think of Barth and Brunner, they cannot be dismissed quite so summarily as this.

DURHAM. ALAN RICHARDSON.

EZECHIELFRAGEN. By Nils Messel. Oslo, 1945. 156 pp. Kr. 13.00.

This latest attempt to solve the problem of the Book of Ezekiel is made by a Norwegian writing in German. Following others before him, the author maintains that the prophet himself ministered exclusively in Jerusalem, though he parts company with his predecessors by explaining the existing Babylonian setting of the book as the result of a misunderstanding of the references to the "captivity." In the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah such phrases as "they of the captivity," or "the children of the captivity," refer clearly to exiles returned to Palestine. So similarly, it is suggested, in Ezekiel. The historical Ezekiel, therefore, prophesied, not in Babylon during the Exile, but in Jerusalem after the return. The description given of the city presupposes Nehemiah's walls, and the situation reflected, with the idolatrous party in possession of the temple, argues a period after Nehemiah's death. The date which Dr Messel accordingly assigns to the prophet is somewhere about 400.

Ezekiel, however, did not himself arrange his prophecies. He left them on a number of odd leaves. A redactor, who lived perhaps fifty years later, has worked over these leaves, frequently transposing the true chronological order and adding a good deal of his own (though

often borrowing heavily from the genuine Ezekiel), in an effort to make the whole fit the situation of his own day, particularly as regards Egypt. There are also a few "post-redactional" additions and glosses; but these are comparatively few. Thus the Parable of the Caldron in xxiv, 1-14 is analysed as follows:

> Ezekiel: verses 1 (except the date), 3-5 (and *son of man* in 2).
> Redactor: verses 6-14.
> Later additions: verses 1 (the date) and 2.

Obviously such exact analysis must be at the best highly precarious, and it is therefore unlikely to commend itself to the more conservative of British scholars. Nevertheless, we should not allow our doubts about details to blind our eyes to the merits of the work as a whole. There are a number of ingenious textual emendations suggested, quite apart from several extremely interesting exegetical points, which are well worth consideration on their own. And at the very least it must be admitted that the thesis in general is attractive, and that the solution proposed is quite as likely to be correct as any of the other solutions with which of late we have been made familiar.

Birmingham. H. F. D. Sparks.

Heritage of Byzantium. By Marcu Beza. S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.

This book has several interesting photographs as illustrations and is well produced. It consists of articles originally published in the periodicals *Hellas* and *Free Europe*, chiefly concerning the writer's personal experiences before the war in the Balkans and the Levant.

Some of the articles are charming, although one suspects that they would read better in French or Rumanian. The writer's English, although generally free from grammatical faults, is scarcely idiomatic, and his taste in descriptions does not suit our language well.

But the book, with its name, and the second part of it being entitled, strangely enough, "Orthodoxy in the Balkans," seems to demand some comment on the author's conception of Byzantine civilization. The English reader will learn hardly anything here of the significance of Orthodoxy. The author is anxious to show the classical Greek derivation of modern Balkan customs. He goes "in search of Hellenic shrines" even in Palestine, where he misses the Hebraic and Biblical background. He sees Hellenism as the uniting force in the Balkans, and this is in many ways a sound and timely observation. But it was Christian Hellenism or "Eastern Romanism," the Eastern Roman Empire and not Pagan Hellenism, which united Greeks, Latins such as the Wallachians, and invaders like the Slavs and Bulgars, while preserving for each group its own language, in a common culture, which persisted under the Turks in the "Rum Millet," the Orthodox "Roman" nation, including all Turkish subjects of the Greek faith.

There are some curious mistakes. How is it that "twenty-four centuries" separate us from the inmates of Mar Saba? One does not travel to the monastery in a "Time Machine." I have been there when the inmates included a former grocer from Chicago and a

former steward on many liners. S. Saba lived in the fifth century A.D. Twenty-four centuries ago his forerunner was Jonadad, the son of Rechab, the Biblical ascetic (p. 19). The author does not seem to understand the source of Orthodoxy. Perhaps it is for that reason that it is for him so exclusively a thing of the past, ending with the wars of independence in the nineteenth century.

E. Every.

London.

The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition. By C. K. Barrett. S.P.C.K. 176 pp. 15s.

This is a most important and valuable work. It will demand attention, especially from those scholars who, though they perhaps know something about the byways of Hellenic and Hellenistic religion, seem to be fundamentally ignorant of the ethos of Christianity and of the religious atmosphere in which it was born. Their theories and suggestions the author treats with a respect and sympathy far greater than many of them deserve, only once allowing himself the remark, which would be equally apposite in many other connexions, "It is difficult to know what to reply to such fantastic exegesis." Even in this case he has a reply, stated in objective terms such as ought to convince those who are learnedly ignorant enough to have entertained such fantasies.

If the author's patience is remarkable, so is his learning. His personal convictions are no more than hinted at, and that only in the last few pages of the book. His discussion of the questions raised is entirely unprejudiced, the conclusions following by logical process of argument; and it is noteworthy from what unpromising premisses he succeeds in arriving at a position which (though he does not seem to know it) is little removed from that which was common form even among the unlearned half a century ago.

The book falls into two parts, of which the first deals with the Gospel record, here regarded as the views of the later apostolic age upon the Person and work of our Lord; while the second, beginning with an account of the activity of the Spirit in the church, raises and answers the question why, in view of the spiritual aliveness of apostolic Christianity, so little is said in the Gospels about any activity of the Spirit. The obvious answer, that the Spirit was not yet "given," because Jesus was not yet glorified, is of course ruled out by the rejection of the Fourth Gospel as an authentic record: though, after many *ambages*, that is substantially the conclusion arrived at.

Behind the criticisms which follow let it be remembered that we have said that this is a highly valuable and important work, of which full account will have to be taken in all future discussions of these subjects. Two things especially need to be said. First, the author seems, perhaps only for purposes of discussion, to relinquish or even repudiate any idea of the personality of the Holy Spirit; the neuter pronoun is often used, and generally the Spirit is regarded as divine power and not as a divine Person. The apparent reason for this is the desire to avoid confusion with heathen ideas of obsession by spirits.

It would perhaps have been worth while to enquire whether the traditional Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit is tenable in the light of the premisses here assumed, and in what sense it differs from those pagan aspects of thought which it is certainly desirable to avoid. Secondly, following on from that, is the repeated description of our Lord as a "spiritual" person, in the particular sense of that word which requires inverted commas or the substitution of the German word *Pneumatiker*, and the suggestion that the impression He made upon His contemporaries was in some way mysterious or numinous. All one can say about this is that there is no evidence in the Gospels that the impression our Lord made was of this kind. He certainly did impress both His friends and His enemies; but He was equally certainly neither an Apollonius of Tyana nor a Hermes Trismegistus, and His disciples' judgment was not "Thou art a mysterious person with unusual spiritual powers," but "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God"—and that indeed seems to be the conclusion to which our author is almost conscious of leading us.

E. Evans.

Hellifield.

The Life and Faith of the Baptists. By H. Wheeler Robinson. Kingsgate Press. 6s.

Perhaps of all Nonconformist bodies Anglicans find the Baptists the hardest to understand. This is no doubt partly due to the fact that we know so little about them. Therefore, we are grateful for this helpful little volume, a second edition, from the pen of that much lamented Old Testament scholar, Dr Wheeler Robinson, who passed from us two years ago.

Dr Robinson opens his book with an interesting and useful account of the origin and principles of the Baptists. This is followed by a careful study of characters and scenes drawn from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, employed "to bring out some features of Baptist life in concrete form." It must be admitted that the characters selected are most unattractive, and the shocking story of poor little Caleb, a consumptive child of ten years, taken almost in a dying condition from his bed to be baptized in the river Thames makes us think how much happier the little sufferer would have been if his parents had sent for a sympathetic priest who would have baptized him and given him his Communion in his bedroom.

Dr Robinson gives us a valuable and careful exposition of the main plank in the Baptist creed—"Believers' baptism and the emphasis on individual experience." Believers' baptism *is strictly and primarily an ethical act on the part of the baptized* (the italics are his). Baptist teaching seems all emphasis on personal effort, personal initiative, an incessant appeal to a single spiritual experience: "You know what you were then: see what you ought to be now." A Faith like this leaves us puzzled. We wonder what has become of the New Testament doctrine of grace!

Dr Robinson points out in conclusion that great changes have taken place in the life of the community. "Other changes equally great will

mark our future development, and no man can foresee them." The Baptist future "seems to depend on the relation to the distinctive feature of believers' baptism." Baptists must make more or less of it. If they make less they will be absorbed into Congregationalism. If they make more, it must be along the line "of a greater spiritual content, and not simply of a literalistic appeal to the Bible."

We are very grateful for this clear, helpful and scholarly exposition of a creed which, however far it may appear to be from our own, we must try to learn about and to understand. It is a creed which has inspired its adherents to a noble stand for religious freedom and a splendid missionary spirit, and a deep personal devotion to our Lord.

OXFORD. R. D. MIDDLETON.

A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH BAPTISTS. By A. C. Underwood. Kingsgate Press. 12s. 6d.

WHAT BAPTISTS STAND FOR. By Henry Cook. Kingsgate Press. 6s.

Of all the Christian bodies in England, the Baptists are generally the most often misrepresented and the least understood by members of the other denominations. This misunderstanding arises from a failure to appreciate the Baptist doctrine of the Church. This doctrine was expressed in 1926 in the Reply of the Baptist Union to the Lambeth Appeal, which affirmed its belief in "the Catholic Church as the holy society of believers in our Lord Jesus Christ, which He founded, of which He is the only Head, and in which He dwells by His Spirit, so that, though made up of many communions, organized in different modes, and scattered throughout the world, it is yet one in Him." It is this doctrine of the Church which leads to what is sometimes regarded as Baptist intransigeance in matters affecting Christian reunion, for it is clear that, for those holding this doctrine, the problem of reunion does not exist in any full sense, though certain individual Baptists have made notable contributions to the Œcumenical Movement.

Mr Cook devotes a considerable section of his book to expounding the Baptist doctrine of the Church and, although his exposition may not convince members of other churches, yet its clarity will be of great value to them in acquainting them with the fundamental Baptist position.

The second point on which there is often a misunderstanding of the Baptist position concerns the doctrine of Baptism. Their doctrine of Baptism is, naturally, connected closely with their doctrine of the Church, though on the nature of that connexion the Baptists themselves are divided. The majority of Baptists restrict the full privileges of church membership to baptized believers, though considerable minorities in all countries regard baptism as optional and regard faith in Christ as the only condition of membership. Both the books before us deal at some length with this division of Baptist opinion, and Dr Underwood shows how sharp the division has sometimes been. Both groups of Baptists are united, however, in regarding the church as composed only of believers, and both groups therefore restrict baptism to those who make an affirmation of personal faith in Christ.

Both these books have a topical interest at a time when Christians are looking towards new œcumenical horizons with the approach of the Amsterdam meeting. They are complementary one to another, and together give a very clear and graphic picture of one of the larger and more important Christian denominations.

Northolt Park. Henry R. T. Brandreth, O.G.S.

Prophecy and Tradition: The Prophetic Books in the Light of the Study of the Growth and History of the Tradition. By Sigmund Mowinckel. Jacob Dybwad, Oslo. Kr. 10.00.

The "traditio-historical" method of research as applied to the Old Testament is no new thing. The pioneers of it were Gunkel and Gressmann, and it has found a steady stream of exponents since their day. Prominent among them is the author of this monograph, which is a study of the prophetic literature in the light of this research method. The method represents in origin an attempt to go behind the sources, which literary criticism has isolated, to a study of the "smaller original units which might be supposed to have existed orally before they were 'collected' and 'edited' by the respective 'authors' of the 'sources'" (p. 8). The historical traditions in the Pentateuch and in the historical books of the Old Testament are by this method shown to represent to a great extent an oral "popular" tradition. Similarly in the case of the prophetic literature. The prophets are seen to be oral teachers, whose sayings were transmitted orally, at any rate in part, before they were written down (p. 5*f.*). The original traditionary unit in their case will have been, not a lengthy speech, but a short oracle (p. 16). This small, separate unit was the starting point for the formation of the tradition. The nature of the traditions, their origin, growth, development, the changes they underwent, the collecting of them into larger units, the formation of these larger units into books, and even the further oral transmission of books—all this it is the function of the "traditio-historical" method to investigate.

It is not easy, within the limits of a review, to give an adequate account of a work into which so much material has been concentrated in so small a compass. It must suffice to mention a few points of interest which will at the same time give the reader some idea of the kind of problem with which the author deals. We may mention first, as being of particular interest and importance, the author's discussion of the relation between the "traditio-historical" method on the one hand, and literary criticism on the other. The terms "tradition history" and literary criticism have sometimes been employed in opposition to each other, the implication being that literary criticism is completely inadequate for the study of the material which is to be found in the Old Testament. This so-called bankruptcy of literary criticism has been proclaimed strongly, for example, by Professor Engnell, of Uppsala (p. 17*ff.*). That the "traditio-historical" method has had some fatal consequences for literary criticism, viewed as source criticism, the author would not deny (p. 19). But he is firm

in his conviction that there is no question here of alternatives. It is no a question of choice between the literary critical method and the "traditio-historical" method. Both are necessary (pp. 7, 16, 19*ff.*, 76). The book of Jeremiah provides a good example of the double task which lies before the Old Testament scholar to-day. The first, which is a task for the literary critic, is "to find out, if possible, what was the original Baruch roll, and what are 'the many (other) like words' which have been 'added to it' "; the second, which is a task for the "tradition historian," is "to try, if possible, to find out what may have been the original Jeremian 'nucleus' in the deuteronomized prose tales" (p. 22).

Some other points of interest may be referred to more briefly. We may note, for example, the author's discussion of the transmission of the sayings of "Deutero-Isaiah" and of "Trito-Isaiah" as an appendix to the book of Isaiah in relation to what is an essential element in "tradition history"—viz., the connexion between tradition about a prophet and the incorporation of younger prophecies into it (p. 66*f.*); his remarks on the attempt to distinguish between the strata of tradition, and in this connexion his view that the book of Ezekiel, in its present form, is the work of "Ezekiel's" disciples after the restoration in the early Persian period (p. 84*f.*); his claim that the "traditio-historical" method provides a more vivid and faithful picture of the spiritual life within the circle of a prophet's disciples and within the Jewish congregation, and that it enables it to be better understood that the younger elements in prophecy are no less inspired than the old (p. 70); his treatment of the means which are available for the separation of the original prophetic sayings (p. 42*ff.*), and his discovery in "Deutero-Isaiah" of fifty quite independent sayings (p. 59)—in Hosea thirty-nine such sayings have been found, and in Amos thirty-two or thirty-three (p. 51); and finally, his contention that the attempt to arrive at the *ipsissima verba* of the prophets is not, as some believe, of no avail, but is a legitimate aim of research (pp. 18, 36, 88).

Enough has been said, it is hoped, to indicate the importance of this monograph. Its importance is indeed out of all proportion to its size. It is the greater pity, therefore, that the English style in which it is written makes it so difficult to read. Moreover, it abounds in misprints. Yet if the reader will persevere, he will be well rewarded. For he will find here a discussion, such as he will find nowhere else, of the nature, aims and limits of a type of Old Testament research whose results are having weighty repercussions upon the literary critical position commonly associated with the name of Wellhausen. The nineteen closely printed pages of notes add substantially to the value of the work.

ZUR FRAGE NACH DOKUMENTARISCHEN QUELLEN IN JOSUA, xiii-xix. By Sigmund Mowinckel. Jacob Dybwad, Oslo. Kr. 3.00.

This monograph is illustrative of the "tension" between literary criticism and "tradition history" to which reference has been made above. Its thesis, briefly stated, is as follows. Josh. xiii-xix are, as is well known, usually attributed to the Priestly writer. The question is

whether P is to be regarded as a "compiler," who worked with written sources, or whether he is not rather to be regarded as the real "author," working, not with written sources, but with ancient traditions. Representative of the first view is Alt, whose work, with that of Noth, the author of this monograph subjects to careful examination. Alt argues, for example, that the list of cities of the tribe of Judah, which is to be found in Josh. xv, verses 21-62, goes back to a written source dating from the time of Josiah (p. 7). Professor Mowinckel, however, holds that the case for a written source is not proved, and, moreover, that it is unnecessary to seek such a source here, for P could, he believes, quite easily have composed such a list—and others like it in these chapters—on the basis of living tradition, combined with a knowledge of the geography of Palestine and administrative conditions there in his own day (p. 8*f.*). This view implies, of course, that the Priestly writing was composed in Palestine, and not in Babylon, as has been generally thought (p. 5*f.*). The author does, indeed, allow that P was familiar with the old source in Judges i (p. 22), but a knowledge of other written sources is denied him. P is thus not a "compiler" but the "author," in the real sense, of Josh. xiii-xix. These chapters originate, therefore, from the post-exilic period.

This thesis is presented with great skill. While it may be said that the author succeeds in showing once again that the "traditio-historical" method represents a fruitful tendency in Old Testament research, not all the arguments he employs will find ready acceptance. For example, in his discussion of the possibility of the existence of a written source, dating from the period of the Judges, such as Alt and Noth believe to have been the basis for the lists of the tribal borders in these chapters, the author includes among his arguments against the existence of such a source the fact that no such lists have been discovered by the archæologists, the administrative lists which have been found at Ras Shamra being of an entirely different character (p. 18*f.*). The *argumentum e silentio*, always hazardous, is especially dangerous in the archæological sphere.

Several interesting points emerge from this study. Two may be mentioned. First, the author maintains that in the period of the Judges there was a system of ten tribes, and that the system of twelve tribes is not earlier than the time of David (p. 20*ff.*). Secondly, he attributes the comparative lack of interest shown by P in Ephraim and Manasseh to the fact that P regarded them as representative of Samaria and the schismatic Samaritans. P's attitude to the northern tribes in general is to be explained, the author thinks, not so much by the fact that he was a southerner, but by the fact that he was a Jew (p. 32*f.*).

Cambridge. D. Winton Thomas.

SHORTER NOTICES

Cowley Sermons. Mowbray. 8s. 6d.

It was a happy idea to mark the jubilee of the Conventual Church of the Society of St John the Evangelist in Oxford by publishing a selection of the sermons that have been preached there during the last fifty years. The book contains thirty sermons, and no single preacher is represented by more than one discourse. Most are by members of the S.S.J.E., and they provide an epitome of the teaching of the Society. There are also sermons preached on special occasions by the Bishop of Oxford and others. The present Bishop of Brechin contributes an introduction on the Religious Life. A. R. V.

Prayers of the World-wide Church. S.P.G. 3s. 6d.

This is a good collection of "missionary" prayers for public or private use. Its title indicates that it is an attempt to provide forms of prayer that are suited to the new kind of relationship that is growing up between the older and the younger churches. A. R. V.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: John Martin, *From Failure to Fulfilment* (7s. 6d.).
BLACK: R. C. Mortimer, *The Elements of Moral Theology* (10s. 6d.).
BLACKFRIARS: A. M. Carré, *Companions for Eternity* (2s. 6d.); A. Gardeil, *Christ Consciousness* (2s.); Ferdinand Valentine, *The Inside of the Cup* (6s.).
BLACKWELL: Francis Wright Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter* (15s.).
BLES: J. B. Phillips, *Letters to Young Churches* (10s. 6d.); Don Luigi Sturzo, *The True Life* (15s.).
BRUCE PUBLISHING CO. (MILWAUKEE): Donald Attwater, *The Christian Churches of the East* ($4.).
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: F. Brittain, *Arthur Quiller-Couch* (15s.); E. G. Rupp, *Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition* (8s. 6d.).
CHRISTOPHERS: John Baillie, *What is Christian Civilization?* (5s.).
CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS: U. W. A. Parkes, *Pictures in Line and Word* (5s.).
DACRE PRESS: A. G. Hebert, *An Essay in Baptismal Revision* (2s.).
DENNIS DOBSON: Paul Derrick, *Lost Property* (8s. 6d.).
JACOB DYBWAD (OSLO): Sigmund Mowinckel, *Zur Frage nach Dokumentarischen Quellen in Josua* 13-19 (Kr. 3.00); *Prophecy and Tradition: The Prophetic Books in the Light of the Study of the Growth and History of the Tradition* (Kr. 10.00).
EALING BOOKS: *Six Booklets on the Church* (6d. each).
EAST AND WEST LIBRARY: Hans Levy, *Philosophia Judaica, Selections from the Writings of Philo* (7s. 6d.); Leon Simon (editor), *Ahad-Ha-Am: Essays, Letters, Memoirs* (12s. 6d.).
FABER AND FABER: Maurice B. Reckitt, *Maurice to Temple* (16s.).
HODDER AND STOUGHTON: Peter Green, *A Book of Parish Intercessions* (2s. 6d.); Edward S. Woods, *What is this Christianity?* (7s. 6d.).
HOLLIS AND CARTER: Michael de la Bedoyere, *Catherine, Saint of Siena* (12s. 6d.).

INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL: *The Witness of a Revolutionary Church* (9d.).
I.V.F.: G. T. Manley (editor), *Search the Scriptures* (3s. 6d.).
LATIMER HOUSE: Charles Duell Kean, *The Meaning of Existence* (12s. 6d.).
LUTTERWORTH PRESS: D. M. Miller, *The Topical Bible Concordance* (5s.); G. R. Beasley Murray, *Christ is Alive!* (7s. 6d.).
MOWBRAY: *A Directory of Ceremonial*, Part I (Alcuin Club Tracts, No. XIII) (5s.); *Jean, A Story of Vocation* (By a Religious) (5s.).
NATIONAL MAGAZINE CO.: Hendrik Willem van Loon, *The Story of the Bible* (21s.).
PHILLIPSON AND GOLDER: F. B. Heiser, *The Story of St Aidan's College, Birkenhead, 1847-1947* (n.p.).
R.E.P.: Henry David Gray, *A Theology for Youth* (5s.).
SANDS AND CO.: C. J. Woollen, *About Jesus* (6s.); S.N.D., *Religious Teaching of Young Children.* (5s.).
S.C.M. PRESS: John Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress* (12s. 6d.); T. E. Jessop, *Evangelism and Education* (6s.); Heinrich Vogel, *The Grace of God and German Guilt* (2s. 6d.).
S.P.C.K.: H. R. T. Brandreth, *Episcopi Vagantes and the Anglican Church* (6s. 6d.); J. T. Davies, *A Teacher's Handbook on the Church Catechism* (4s.); Sir Charles Jeffries, *Nebuchadnezzar's Image* (1s. 3d.); J. S. Lawton, *Conflict in Christology* (20s.); B. T. Page, *The Harvest of Good Hope* (12s.).
TYNDALE PRESS: F. Colquhoun, *The Meaning of the Cross* (1s.); J. Stafford Wright, *Understanding the Pentateuch* (1s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher